

THE REFORMED THEOLOGICAL REVIEW



CONTENTS

	Page
"A HISTORY OF THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT 1517-1948"	1
By the Rev. Professor Hermann Sasse, Lic.Theol., S.T.M., D.Theol., Immanuel Theological Seminary, Adelaide.	
THE DAY OF ATONEMENT AND THE WORK OF CHRIST	9
By the Rev. Leon L. Morris, B.Sc., M.Th., Ph.D., Vice- Principal, Ridley College, Melbourne.	
BOOK REVIEWS	20
(See inside back cover.)	

PRICE: TWO SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE

THE REFORMED THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

EDITORS:

THE VERY REV. PRINCIPAL S. BARTON BABBAGE, M.A.,
Ph.D., Th.D., Melbourne.

THE REV. ROBERT SWANTON, M.A., B.D., Melbourne.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

THE REV. JOHN AITKEN, B.A., B.D., Bendigo, Vic.

THE REV. J. A. MUNRO FORD, B.A., B.D., Ph.D., Adelaide.

THE REV. M. W. J. GEURSEN, B.A., B.D., Melbourne.

THE VEN. ARCHDEACON T. C. HAMMOND, M.A., Th.D.,
Sydney.

THE REV. PROFESSOR JOHN HENDERSON, M.A., Ph.D.,
Dunedin.

THE REV. D. BROUGHTON KNOX, B.A., B.D., M.Th., D.Phil.,
Sydney.

THE REV. PROFESSOR JOHN McINTYRE, M.A., B.D., D.Litt.,
Sydney.

THE REV. ALLAN MacKILLOP, B.A., B.D., Brisbane.

THE REV. NEIL MacLEOD, M.A., B.D., Hamilton, Vic.

THE REV. L. L. MORRIS, B.Sc., B.D., M.Th., Ph.D., Melbourne.

THE REV. PROFESSOR J. F. PETER, B.A., B.D., Dip.Ed.,
Brisbane.

Contributors enjoy reasonable liberty in
the exposition of the Christian Faith.
The Editors are not responsible for
every opinion that may be expressed.

ISSUED THRICE YEARLY

Communications and Subscriptions should be forwarded
to the Editors, The Manse, 304 Glenferrie Road, Hawthorn,
Melbourne, E.2. Subscribers in New Zealand should forward
their subscriptions to the Presbyterian Bookroom, P.O.
Box 389, Dunedin.

Annual Subscription:

Seven Shillings and Sixpence (Foreign, 8/-), post free.

THE REFORMED THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Vol. XIV, No. 1

FEBRUARY, 1955

"A History of the Ecumenical Movement 1517-1948"*

If a team of 15 authors, some of whom are scholars of world fame, undertakes to write a voluminous symposium on a highly important subject, one might well expect a really good book. The present book contains, indeed, excellent contributions. We mention here only the chapter on ecumenical bearings of the missionary movement by Prof. Latourette, the contributions by the Eastern theologians Dr. Florovsky and Dr. Zernov on the ecumenical relationships of the Orthodox Churches prior to and after 1910, furthermore the excellent presentation of the history of the World Conference on Faith and Order by Canon Tissington Tatlow and the movement on "Life and Work" and the ecumenical endeavours connected with it by the Swedish scholars N. Karlström and N. Ehrenström. In these chapters which deal with the modern Ecumenical Movement since 1910 personal reminiscence and careful study of the rich sources still available have formed a solid basis. Unfortunately one of the most complete collections of documents and especially letters seems to have been lost. Shortly before his death A. Deissmann told me that he was going to bequeath his great ecumenical archive to the State Library at Berlin. I tried to persuade him to leave these documents not to a library controlled by the Nazi government but rather to a church archive. The vast correspondence of this great champion of ecumenical Christianity in Germany and Europe will, if it can still be found, help to realize what an important role has been played by individual Christians, and not only by conferences, organisations and church leaders. Thus one misses with regret the name of Jules Rambaud and his "German-

* Edited by Ruth Rouse and Stephen Charles Neill (published on behalf of the Ecumenical Institute Chateau de Bossey by S.P.C.K., London), 1954, pp. 822; 32/6.

French Unity"—at least I could not discover the name of this great French Reformed Christian and pastor. Without the sacrifices of such men and of many an unknown soldier in the rank and file of the Ecumenical Movement of the twenties the great rapprochement of the churches would not have been possible. In this respect even the best parts of the large book share the shortcomings of all church history. If the reader keeps that in mind he will gladly make use of the wealth of first hand information contained in these chapters. May be that the silent passing over of men and events is partly due to the strict limitation of the space available for the single chapters. In many cases the reader is informed that a certain contribution had to be shortened. Sometimes, however, one has the feeling that intentionally not the whole story is told. Not all leaders of the Ecumenical Movement have seen right from the beginning the danger of the totalitarian state. There have been men of high standing in England who believed that the acceptance by Hitler's new "bishops" of the apostolic succession would cure the apparent disease of German Protestantism, just as in Germany some very ecumenically minded High Church people were not far from the new political millenium. The current story of the "Confessional Church" in Germany and the struggle for the freedom of the church in other European countries has to a large degree become a *fable convenue* which needs urgently a "de-mythification," especially in view of the fact that these events are closely linked with the progress of the Ecumenical Movement. But these remarks are not meant to minimize the merit of the chapters dealing with the 20th century. Almost half of the book is devoted to the development since 1910 (chapter 8 to 16, pp. 353-724), from Edinburgh to Amsterdam. The critical reader will be grateful for the vast amount of information on the various branches and aspects of this great movement, the details of which are hardly known to many of our contemporaries after the beginners of the great movement and most of the witnesses of the first conferences have departed from the *ecclesia militans*. We can only wish that future church historians will re-examine the sources and not be satisfied with an account which naturally must be stream-lined, and therefore incomplete.

The great weakness of the book lies in its understanding of what the Ecumenical Movement is. It is, indeed, not easy to define the great spiritual movements which from time to time sweep throughout Christendom irrespective of national or denominational borderlines. How many

various answers can be and have been given to the question what the Reformation or what Pietism is? The present book sees here no problem at all. The foreword, written by Reinold von Thadden-Trieglaff, a Christian layman of high reputation, in his capacity as Chairman of the Board of the Ecumenical Institute, takes it for granted that the Ecumenical Movement is the sum total of church union movements, comprising "(1) co-operation between Christians belonging to different confessions and Churches, (2) co-operation between the several Churches and confessions, (3) union or reunion of separated Churches, (4) the full and final restoration of the unity of all Christendom." Thus understood, the Ecumenical Movement accompanies the whole history of the Church since the Apostolic age, or rather it is one aspect of the history of the Church. It is for practical reasons only that "Division and the search for unity prior to the Reformation" is dealt with by way of an introduction on 24 pages by Bishop Stephen Charles Neill with the help of an Editorial Group. Of special value are the remarks on the Middle Ages. The real history starts with the Age of the Reformation, Prof. J. T. McNeill writing on "The ecumenical idea and efforts to realise it, 1517-1618," Prof. Martin Schmidt on ecumenical activity on the continent of Europe during the 17th and 18th centuries, Prof. N. Sykes on the Ecumenical Movements in Great Britain during the same period. This third chapter is one of the most illuminating of the whole work because it makes visible some of the roots of the modern Ecumenical Movement which would not be what it is but for the fact that English speaking Christendom has carried its own problems into all parts of the world. The same cannot be said of the preceding chapters on the Reformation period and on the 17th and 18th centuries on the Continent, the reason being the simple fact that the strength of the Churches of the Reformation lies just in that which the Ecumenical Movement, as it presents itself in this book, combats: a strict confessionalism. It is certainly not by accident that among the Reformers Bucer, the church politician and negotiator whom even his friends called a fox, the real founder of what later became known as Pietism, appears to be the hero of Ecumenism. While Dr. McNeill tries to do justice to Luther, his presentation of the Marburg Colloquy and the Wittenberg Concord needs correction. In Marburg Luther made an amazing concession which Bucer was prepared to accept, and in Wittenberg Bucer accepted Luther's doctrine. For a local presence of the body of Christ had never been taught by Luther

(as it is even not taught by the Roman Church), and the words in Luther's instruction of 1534 "torn by the teeth" (p. 45) are apocryphal. If Luther at Wittenberg accepted the biblical word "indigni" for "impii" this cannot be interpreted as showing "that he had caught the spirit of Bucer" (p. 46). We mention this example to show that the ideas and ideals of later centuries should not be read into the history of the Reformation. It was Emil Brunner who at the fourth centenary of the Marburg Colloquy warned against measuring the Reformers with the standards of modern Christianity which is so far from the Reformation that it cannot discover the real differences between the Reformers, and which does no longer understand that the strength of the Reformation lay in the inexorable seriousness with which the Reformers regarded their confessions. The problem of intercommunion did not exist at all. All churches of the 16th century, as the church of all ages, were convinced that intercommunion is possible only where the consensus doctrinae exists. The point at issue between the Reformed and Lutheran Churches of the 16th and 17th centuries has never been the problem whether or not members of other churches could be admitted to the Lord's Supper. It was solely the question where the border line of the Church was to be found. When Strassburg had accepted the Wittenberg Concord and the Augsburg Confession, the Church of Zuerich did no longer allow their students to receive the sacrament at Strassburg. The idea that there could be intercommunion with the Baptists would have been quite inconceivable even to Zwingli. The churches of the Reformation continued simply the usage of the Church since the beginning. There is not and cannot be a *communicatio in sacris cum haereticis aut schismaticis*. This principle of the Catholic Church of all ages was maintained until at the end of the 17th century the division of Christendom was taken for granted. One must never forget: Luther was not a Lutheran, nor was Calvin a Calvinist. Either wanted to be, and was in his way, as he understood himself, a Catholic. There is an astonishing amount of a common medieval heritage in the great confessions of the 16th century, and this common doctrinal heritage in connection with the general conviction that the unity was only temporarily lost made the great debate possible which went on up to the later part of the 17th century between Romans, Lutherans and Reformed and which cannot be understood as controversy only. Maybe that the shortening of Prof. Schmidt's contribution is responsible for the fact that the truly ecumenical work of

17th century Orthodoxy is not mentioned at all. Neither Johann Gerhard's great *Confessio Catholica*, nor the *Historia Syncretistica* by A. Calov, nor E. C. Cyprian's book on Church union with its valuable and otherwise not accessible documents are even mentioned. One of the most important aspects of the life of the Church in the 16th and 17th centuries has been neglected completely: the common liturgical heritage. Not only in some German monasteries or Chapters which had survived the Reformation adherents of the Augsburg Confession and of the Roman Church continued their common canonical hours (the material has been collected and partly published by Prof. Nottarp at Koenigsberg, now Kaliningrad), but also in purely Lutheran churches much of the old Latin liturgy lived on to the turn of the 17th and 18th centuries. Just as for Johann Gerhard Thomas Aquinas' *Adoro te devote* was an expression of the evangelical doctrine concerning the Lord's Supper, so the *Lauda Sion salvatorem* was sung in the Lutheran Churches, with slight alterations, in Latin or German. It has been stated that the real disruption of Western Christendom, at least on the Continent, took place at the end of the Orthodox period, not at the time of the Reformation. This importance of Orthodox theology has not been understood in this book. Instead the men of minor stature, Christian humanists like Acontius, Calixtus the discoverer of the *Consensus quinquesaecularis*, religious adventurers like Labadie and the leading characters of Pietism, all of whom are distinguished by a lack of understanding of the Church of the New Testament and by an individualism which was quite foreign to the Reformation, appear here as heroes of Ecumenism. Even a religious genius like Zinzendorf has never been able to overcome the idea of the church as a society of pious individuals. This understanding of the Church together with the idea that the essence of Christianity is "the religion in which we all agree" (be it the Apostles' Creed, or the *consensus quinquesaecularis*, or the natural religion of enlightenment) was the heritage which was left to the 19th century.

This important century is dealt with in three chapters: "Christian Unity in 19th century America" by Dr. Yoder, "Approaches of the Churches towards each other" by H. R. T. Brandreth, Priest of the Oratory of the Good Shepherd in Paris, and "Voluntary Movements and the Changing Ecumenical Climate" by Dr. Ruth Rouse. The chapter on American is, despite its brevity, highly interesting, though the author does not seem to realize that the real contribution to the understanding of the

Una Sancta was not made by the enthusiasts of the union movements, but rather by those who took seriously the European heritage of doctrine and liturgy. Father Brandreth makes a good start in observing (p. 263ff.) in a similar way as Dr. Florovsky (p. 195f.) the real origin of the Ecumenical Movement in the years since 1828 when the great awakening which originally in the early 19th century had been a renewal of Pietism turned into a new discovery of the Church. Moehler's famous book on the *Unity in the Church* which led the Roman Church back from a pietistic or ethical understanding of the Church to a new realization of the doctrine on the body of Christ, Chomjakov's discovery of the Orthodox doctrine on the unity of the Church, the beginnings of the Tractarian Movement in England, and, we could add, the revival of Lutheranism and of the Reformed understanding of the Church on the Continent: all this produced the real ecumenical movement which is not interested in increasing the number of Christian denominations by establishing new and various union churches, but in the *Una Sancta, Catholica et Apostolica Ecclesia*. In this sense the foundation of the great World Denominational Fellowships is rightly regarded by Father Brandreth as one of the most outstanding features of the 19th century. But why does he not mention the "Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Konferenz" of 1868 which for the first time brought together the Lutherans of Germany, Scandinavia and America and thus has become the mother of the later world organisations of Lutheranism. In a history of the Ecumenical Movement it belongs together with the corresponding world organisations of the Anglicans, Reformed-Presbyterians, Methodists, Congregationalists and Baptists. Dr. Ruth Rouse, in a later chapter "Other aspects of the Ecumenical Movement, 1910-48" (p. 599-641), gives among most valuable information another review of these "World Denominational Fellowships." Here the "General Lutheran Conference" is mentioned together with the "Lutheran World Convention" of 1923, but its importance has not been fully realized. Also about the unions in Germany the learned Father Brandreth is not very well informed. The Prussian Union, like the corresponding unions in Baden, the Palatinate, Nassau, etc., are results of that dogmatical indifference which prevailed during the 18th century and the Erastian idea of Enlightenment that it is up to the state to determine the order of the church. Otherwise these various union churches would not have adopted quite different doctrinal statements and catechisms. Thus far it has proved to be

impossible to unite these union churches, and Spener's warning against the plans of a union between Lutherans and Reformed has been confirmed by history. Repeatedly he predicted that such union would not lead to one, but to three or four churches. It is much to be regretted that the history of the Church in Germany in the 19th century seems to be unknown. Otherwise it would be a serious warning to other churches. Sometimes it seems that all the mistakes made in Europe during the 19th century, including such futile enterprises as the Anglo-Prussian Bishopric of Jerusalem (p. 288) the establishment of which was one of the blows which drove J. H. Newman to Rome, are being repeated in our time on a world-wide scale. One gets this impression from a later chapter of the book written by Bishop Neill on the plans of union and reunion, 1910-48 (p. 445-495). "To what does it all lead?" This question is put by the learned bishop at the end of his review of the unions made in our time in Scotland, Canada, Germany, China, South India, Ceylon and other countries. It is a question to be thought over, not to be answered. At any rate it will not lead to a future Reunited Church on earth. It is a grave misunderstanding of John 17 if the eschatological character of Christ's *ut omnes unum sint* is not realized. It is a misunderstanding of the New Testament doctrine on the church if the biblical warnings against heresies are no longer taken seriously. It is the greatest misunderstanding of the history of the Early Church if the fact is overlooked that Christendom has never been a visible unity. The people of God sojourns in this world, it appears here and there, in Corinth or in Rome, in larger or smaller communities, even where two or three are gathered in Christ's name, the greatest reality in the history of mankind, but hidden to our human eyes under the cross, under false Christians and soul-destroying heresies.

Here lies the greatest weakness of the World Council of Churches the genesis of which is narrated by Dr. Visser't Hooft (p. 697-724). This Council is not able and never will be able to distinguish between truth and error, church and heresy. It has to take into full membership every Christian community which accepts a formula which says nothing at all. If one of the great Creeds of the Ancient Church would be the basis, e.g., the Nicene Creed which was accepted by Lausanne in 1928, the WCC would break asunder. Certainly, the WCC can speak to the world and to the churches. Its pronouncements, however, are made in *futuram oblivionem* only. Who remembers the pronounce-

ments of Amsterdam, of Oxford and Edinburgh in 1937, of Jerusalem, Tambaram, Willingen? Who will remember in one or two years' time what Evanston had to say about the Christian hope? But what the Apostles' and the Nicene Creed say about that hope will sound through the ages until the Coming of Christ in glory because it is the content of God's Word. In spite of all publicity, secured by modern means of communication and by the highly developed art of influencing the masses, the simplest papal encyclical is of greater importance than all the papers of an Ecumenical Conference. What is the reason for that? Is it perhaps the fact that the real strength of the churches is not to be found in the "religion in which we all agree," but rather in those things in which we disagree? These are questions which every thinking reader of this volume must ask. No greater damage could be done to the cause of Christianity in the world as if this book would get a sort of canonical dignity. It does not claim that. But uncritical readers, especially in the younger churches and in the Christian youth movements, might overlook the statement of the foreword that nobody is responsible for the work. "This History is in no sense an official publication of the World Council of Churches; the Council is not responsible for anything contained in the volume except the quotations from its official publications," although the WCC has promoted and discussed at its meetings the book for years. This happy irresponsibility is shared even by the Board of the Ecumenical Institute which "in sponsoring the writing of the History has not accepted responsibility for all or any statements contained in it" (p. XXI). If anywhere, then in this evading responsibility the deepest weakness of the modern Ecumenical movement becomes evident, a real tragedy of the Protestant Churches. For no Catholic, no Eastern Orthodox Church, even not the few remnants of Eastern Christendom which are still members, will ever accept this attitude which reveals the profound disease of the churches which with their confessions have abandoned the quest for truth. It will be the great task of those churches which still know the authority of Scripture and of the confession of the biblical truth, to call their sisters back, in all humility, from a road which otherwise must lead to a catastrophe.

North Adelaide.

HERMANN SASSE.

* * * *

Some suggestions for a future new edition may be added. The problem of unity, schism and heresy in the Ancient Church has lately been discussed in very valuable monographs, two of the most important

being the books by the late Dr. W. Elert: *Abendmahl und Kirchengemeinschaft in der alten Kirche, hauptsaechlich des Ostens* (Berlin, 1954) and S. L. Greenslade *Schisms in the Early Church* (London, 1953). Nicolaus Cusanus and his great work *De concordantia catholica* (1433) must be mentioned. The Lutheran Church (Missouri Synod) is not a daughter of the Lutheran Church in Prussia, but in Saxony; the Prussian Lutherans founded the Buffalo Synod and the Lutheran Church in Australia (p. 325). Whether the Missouri Synod "has proved a serious obstacle to union even amongst Lutherans" or not depends on what by true union is to be understood. A book like this should avoid censuring churches for not joining the W.C.C., especially if the contributor does not know exactly the Lutheran doctrine of the church. The remark on Dollinger (p. 293) as the most powerful mind among the Old Catholics should be formulated more cautiously. Dollinger was never a member of the Old Catholic Church whose development especially after the abolition of celibacy he very much regretted. Finally, a question may be put to our Anglican friends. Nobody would like to minimize the importance of the Anglican Communion. But has not the time come when this great branch of Christendom owes it to the whole of Christendom, and especially to the younger churches, to make it quite clear what it means by apostolic succession, what it understands a "priest" to be in contradistinction to a minister of a Lutheran or Reformed or Methodist Church? These are questions which must be answered on the basis of the New Testament. Furthermore it must be made clear what the claims of the Anglican Church mean in view of the fact that the Roman Church can and will not recognize the Anglican Orders and that the same is true of the Orthodox Churches. For a recognition based on "economy" is no recognition at all. It would be better to drop the distinction between the interpretation of canon law *kat' akribian* and *kat' oikonomian*. The Western Church does not know such *oikonomia* which in Latin would be *pia fraus*. The poor patriarchs and bishops of the East could perhaps not exist in view of the tyranny of their emperors and sultans without such doubtful means of saving their face. We Christians of the West, of a free world should not employ such methods.

The Day of Atonement and the Work of Christ

The Day of Atonement is never mentioned by name in the New Testament, but there are passages which clearly refer to it, as for example. Ac 27.9, where it is called "the Fast," a usage which can be paralleled from Jos. Ant. xvii 6.4 and the Epistle of Barnabas vii 3,4. But here it is simply a note of time, and there is no doctrinal importance in the way it is used.

The Day of Atonement is probably in mind in Ga 3.13, for "the curse of the law" from which we are redeemed by Christ's being made a curse for us looks very much like a reference to the scapegoat bearing away the sins of the people. This is made more probable in that, while the Old Testament only requires the animal to be led away into the wilderness, the later practice was to push it over the edge of a precipice so that its death was inevitable, and

there was no chance of its making a re-appearance.¹ There is also a possible reference in II Co 5.21 where Christ is said to have been "made sin" for us, words which might well describe the scapegoat laden with the sins of the people.

But in neither of these passages can the meaning be said to turn on the reference to the Day of Atonement, and indeed, many exegetes discern no such reference. At most we can say that these passages are illuminated by thinking of the Day of Atonement, but this is not the central thought.

Many distinguished exegetes from Origen onwards have felt that *hilasterion* in Ro 3.25 means "the mercy-seat," and that accordingly the thought of the passage basically is that Christ in shedding His blood effected all that the Day of Atonement ceremonies before the mercy-seat foreshadowed. In modern times scholars like Buechsel,² T. W. Manson,³ and W. D. Davies⁴ (to name but a few) agree that there is a reference to the Day of Atonement, though they differ in some aspects of their understanding of the term. The principal reason for holding such views is that the term *hilasterion* in the LXX is usually the translation of the Hebrew *kapporeth*, the name given to the gold slab or plate over the ark of the covenant. The usage of the LXX, it is argued, is likely to be determinative for St. Paul, and we must think that he would follow this usage rather than that of secular Greek.

Without attempting to go into the evidence in detail it seems to the present writer that this and the other considerations urged are outweighed by the arguments on the other side. Thus the word *hilasterion* basically is connected with the idea of propitiation,⁵ and *in itself* does not denote a piece of the Temple furniture, the point of connection being that the mercy-seat was the place where the blood was sprinkled and the act of propitiation made. Deissmann has shown conclusively that the word was applied to a wide variety of objects, especially to votive offerings in the cultus of more than one deity, and his conclusion is "Any object whatever, as long as a propitiatory significance is attached to it, can be designated as a *hilasterion*."⁶ While Deissmann's conclusions are often

1. Yom. 6.6.

2. Theol. Woert. iii 321ff.

3. Journal of Theological Studies xlv 1ff.

4. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism 237ff.

5. I have given my reasons for thinking that the *hilaskesthai* word group denotes not expiation (as is often maintained) but propitiation in Expository Times lxi 227ff.

6. Enc. Bib. col. 3033.

rejected this part of his evidence is usually not faced. T. W. Manson, for example, gives no attention at all to the references to votive offerings which Deissmann says are most often of all designated by *hilasterion*, and this would seem to invalidate much of what he says. Again, we should notice that when *hilasterion* in the LXX is used of the mercy-seat it always has the article (except in Ex 25.16 where the noun *epithema* occurs with it), and it is a strong objection that *hilasterion* in Ro 3.25 is anarthrous. These and other considerations make it seem to me unlikely that there is a reference here to the mercy-seat or to the Day of Atonement.

But the Day of Atonement is of great importance for an understanding of the thought of the Epistle to the Hebrews. There the actions of the High Priest on the day of Atonement are regarded as the supreme example of his ministry, and since much of this Epistle is concerned with the High Priestly work of Christ it follows that an understanding of what the Day of Atonement signified to men of the first century is important if we would follow what the atoning work of Christ signified to this writer. It is curious that he never mentions the Day of Atonement by name, but such references as that to the entrance of the High Priest into the Holy of Holies, etc., make it clear that the ceremonies of this day are in mind, especially in chs 9-10.

The Old Testament

The principal passage in the Old Testament is Lv 16 from which we derive most of our knowledge of the ritual of the day. There is no point in repeating its provisions here, but we draw attention to verse 31 which reads, "It is a sabbath of solemn rest unto you, and ye shall afflict your souls; it is a statute for ever." The point is that the day was regarded as one of special solemnity,⁷ and due precautions were enjoined to ensure its being kept in the right manner. Lv 23.29 adds the detail that "whatsoever soul it be that shall not be afflicted in that same day, he shall be cut off from his people," and the next verse tells us that Yahweh will destroy from among the people anyone who does any kind of work on that day. A minor

7. This verse may be otherwise interpreted. Thus T. K. Cheyne drew attention to Jastrow's contention that *shabbath*, *shabbaton*, especially the latter, answer to the Babylonian ceremonial term *shabbatum* "which means a day of propitiation with reference to the dies nefasti of the kings." (Enc. Bib. col. 386). In this case it would be God who is made to rest (i.e. from wrath) rather than man. But in the first place the linguistic basis of this argument is by no means convincing, and in the second, even if it be accepted, the day on which such a noteworthy event occurred would be a very solemn one for the Israelites. But in any case that was a day of cessation from work for men is attested elsewhere.

point of ritual is found in Ex 30.10, a passage describing the altar of incense, where we find that atonement shall be made "upon the horns of it once in the year." This is a rubric not mentioned in Lv 16, but belonging to the cleansing of the holy place (Lv 16.16). The only other passages referring to the Day of Atonement are Nu 29.7-11, which lists the sacrificial offerings then to be made, and Lv 25.9, from which we find that the year of Jubilee was to begin with the Day of Atonement.

It is clear from all this that the day was regarded as one of special importance and solemnity, teaching men that sin matters, so that something must be done about it if men are not to be separated from God.⁸ Two things about the ceremony call for special attention:

The first is that on this day, and on this day only in the year, the High Priest was permitted to enter into the chamber which typified the very presence of God. This is emphasized in the introduction to the day's happenings in Lv 16 where it is access and not atonement which is stressed. "Speak unto Aaron thy brother, that he come not at all times into the holy place within the veil, before the mercy-seat which is upon the ark; that he die not. . . . Here-with shall Aaron come into the holy place" is the introduction to the chapter. In other words the chapter does not say (as is often assumed) "This is the way sins shall be forgiven," but, "This is the way the High Priest shall come into the Presence."⁹

The second is the placing of the sins of the people upon the scapegoat. There is dispute as to what the laying on of hands in sacrifices generally was meant to signify, but in this case there can be no doubt that it signified the placing of the sins of the people upon the animal so that they might be borne away and return no more.

8. The failure of the historical books to mention the Day of Atonement has caused speculation as to the time when it was first observed. Most would agree however, that whenever the full ritual made its appearance much in the rite is of hoary antiquity. For example W.O.E. Oosterley holds the rite to be post-exilic in its present form, but he can say "Most of the ideas, as well as the rites, in connexion with the Day of Atonement go back to pre-exilic times: thus, the ideas of propitiation, expiation, substitution, and transference of evil, are all ancient; similarly with regard to the burnt-offering, the blood-sprinkling rite, fasting, and the observance of the sabbath." *Sacrifice in Ancient Israel*, p. 229.

9. I do not deal here with the contention of many scholars that the chapter is composite, with e.g. verses 1-4, 6, 12, 13, 34b, referring to the way the High Priest enters the Holy of Holies while the remainder (itself regarded as the work of more than one hand) deals with the observance of the Day of Atonement. The point is that the writers of the New Testament treated the account as a unity, and we must endeavour to look at it as they did if we are to see what it meant for them. And however Lv 16 came to be composed it is access which is prominent in the chapter as we now have it.

The Day of Atonement in Rabbinic Literature

In view of the fact that it gives us a picture of the form taken by the ritual during New Testament times it may be well to refer, if only briefly, to the information given in the Rabbinic literature. The Rabbis assumed the ritual given in Leviticus, but supplied various missing details, always it would seem with the idea of heightening the solemnity of the day, with the result that by New Testament times it was the most solemn and important day of the year.¹⁰ Thus we read that the High Priest was kept in the Temple for seven days before the Day of Atonement,¹¹ was sprinkled with the ashes of a heifer on the third and seventh days in case he should have unwittingly contracted defilement,¹² he was continually instructed in the ritual "lest thou has forgotten or lest thou hast never learnt,"¹³ and throughout the seven days he performed in person the ritual connected with the sacrifices.¹⁴ When he prayed on the great day he used the sacred Name, and not the usual reverential periphrasis.¹⁵ There were other things, too, and it is very clear that the Day was felt to be of such solemnity that all its rites must be performed with meticulous care.

One or two points call for our notice. Thus in the casting of lots on the two goats the High Priest put both hands into the casket and took out the two lots, on one of which was written "For the Lord" and on the other "For Azazel." He put that in his right hand on the goat on his right and that in his left on that to his left, saying "A Sin-offering to the Lord" apparently making no difference between the two.¹⁶ This may have significance for the determination of just how the atonement was thought to be effected.

10. Cp G. Buchanan Gray, *Sacrifice in the Old Testament* "in the Jewish religion, in the time of our Lord, the Day of Atonement, with its stress on sin and expiation, with its fasting and solemn rest and inactivity, was the supreme day of the year."

11. Yom. 1:1.

12. I take this point from Maimonides *Hajad Hachazaka* hal. 4 (cited from Delitzsch, *Hebrews* ii 466). Although Maimonides is late his writings often contain early material of which this may be an example. The reference to "the ashes of an heifer sprinkling them that have been defiled" (He 9.13) may be an allusion to this practice.

13. Yom. 1:3.

14. Yom. 1:2.

15. *Sot.* 7.6 says that in giving the blessing "in the Temple they pronounced the Name as it was written, but in the provinces by a substituted word." If this refers to occasions other than the Day of Atonement it is confined to the benediction, whereas on the Day of Atonement the Name was used in prayers of confession, etc. In all it appears to have been used ten times on that day. It is usually held that the Name was employed only on the Day of Atonement, so for example, Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth*, p. 196.

16. Yom. 4:1.

It is prescribed in Lv 16.21 that the High Priest should confess the sins of the people over the scapegoat, and this is mentioned also in the Mishnah. But in the period subsequent to the Old Testament a custom had arisen whereby the worshipper made confession of sin as he laid his hands on the head of any sacrificial victim, and indeed it was sometimes held that such offerings as sin and guilt offerings were inefficacious until confession had been made.¹⁷ In accordance with this custom the Mishnah provides that the High Priest should lay hands on the head of the bullock and make confession of sins. But an unusual thing was that he did this twice, on the first occasion at the beginning of the Day's rites, and the second just prior to the slaughtering. The only difference between the two confessions was that the first time he confessed his own sins of those of his house, while the second time he associated "the children of Aaron, thy holy people" with himself. When later on he confessed the nation's sin over the scapegoat he used exactly the same formula, simply substituting "thy people, the house of Israel" for the priestly caste in the previous confessions.¹⁸ If this is any guide it was felt that much the same was accomplished in laying on the hands on the head of the bullock as on the head of the scapegoat. It is curious that there is no mention either of laying on of hands or confession of sin over the goat for the sin-offering.

It is interesting that the day concluded with scenes of festivity. The High Priest himself, when his day's ministration was concluded, gave a feast for his friends "for that he was come forth safely from the Sanctuary,"¹⁹ and the maidens went forth to dance in the vineyards clad "in white raiments; and these were borrowed, that none should be abashed which had them not," so that Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel could say "There were no happier days for Israel than the 15th of Ab and the Day of Atonement."²⁰ Such passages show us something of the relief and joy that were felt when the nation's sins had been put away and the High Priest had emerged unscathed from his adventurous act of atonement.

It is very clear that great importance was attached to the proper performance of the ritual, but the Mishnah does not regard the removal of sin as automatic when this was done, repentance and restitution being insisted upon.

17. See G. F. Moore, *Judaism* i 512.

18. See Yom. 3.8, 4.2, 6.2.

19. Yom. 7.4.

20. Taan. 4.8.

If a man said, 'I will sin and repent, and sin again and repent,' he will be given no chance to repent. If he said, 'I will sin and the Day of Atonement will effect atonement,' then the Day of Atonement effects no atonement. For transgressions that are between man and God the Day of Atonement effects atonement, but for transgressions that are between a man and his fellow the Day of Atonement effects atonement only if he has appeased his fellow."²¹

The ethical element in this is plain, and G. F. Moore would go further and make this the dominant element in the Jewish conception, for he says "it is the Day of Atonement itself that expiates; for the Day of Atonement, of fasting and humiliation before God, of confession of sins, and contrition for them, and of fervent prayer for forgiveness, was, even before the destruction of the temple, the reality, of which the rites of the day in Jerusalem, whatever objective efficacy was attributed to them, were only a dramatic symbol."²² Some passages could be cited to support this position as Sifra Emor xiv "Though no sacrifices be offered, the day in itself effects atonement,"²³ but these seem to be rationalisations from a time subsequent to the destruction of the Temple. The tractate *Yoma* moves in an atmosphere where the ritual is ordained of God and must be performed with scrupulous care right down to the minutest detail. Lack of repentance will nullify the rite,²⁴ but there is nothing to indicate that in the time when the Temple stood anyone felt that repentance and the like would of themselves avail without the performance of the divinely ordained ceremonial.²⁵

Finally we notice that when the conditions were fulfilled the Day of Atonement was held to make a thorough purging of all the sins of the nation, for we read, "For uncleanness that befalls the Temple and its Hallowed Things through wantonness, atonement is made by the goat whose blood is sprinkled within (the Holy of Holies)

21. Yom. 8.9.

22. *Op cit* p. 500.

23. Quoted in the *Jewish Encyclopedia* ii 286.

24. R. Judah the patriarch was said to have taught that repentance was not necessary, but that on the Day of Atonement the sins of all Israelites except those who had cut themselves off from the nation's religions were expiated. But this view did not command assent. For a discussion of it see *Enc. Bib.* iv col. 4224f., and cp G. F. Moore, *op cit*, ii 152.

25. Thus Yom. 8.8 says "Repentance effects atonement for lesser transgressions against both positive and negative commands in the Law; while for graver transgressions it suspends punishment until the Day of Atonement comes and effects atonement." In line with this is W. Robertson Smith's verdict, "Even in the theology of the Rabbins, penitence atones only for light offences, all grave offences demanding also a material prestation" (*The Religion of the Semites*, p. 434).

and by the Day of Atonement; for all other transgressions spoken of in the Law, venial or grave, wanton or unwitting, conscious or unconscious, sins of omission or of commission, sins punishable by Extirpation or by death at the hand of the court, the scapegoat makes atonement.”²⁶

The Day of Atonement in the Epistle to the Hebrews
(i) Access

Quite in the manner of Lv 16, the writer to the Hebrews introduces his section on the Day of Atonement by referring to access. After speaking of the tabernacle furnishings, and pointing out that the High Priest alone might enter the Holy of Holies, and he only once a year, he proceeds “the Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holy place hath not yet been made manifest, while as the first tabernacle is yet standing; which is a parable for the time now present” (He 9.8f.).

This access is purchased at the price of blood which must be carefully manipulated according to the regulations, for the entrance into the Holy of Holies was an adventure whose outcome could not be foreseen, and thus every precaution must be taken. The use of blood ranks high in the list of precautions, and thus the writer to the Hebrews notes its use, both in the case of the Day of Atonement (9.7), and of the work of Christ (9.12).

The thought of access leads our author to contrast the best that could be done according to the Levitical and Rabbinic rites, with that obtained by Christ, and this in two major ways. The first of them is the nature of the Presence to which access was obtained, and so the “copies of the things in the heavens” are contrasted with “the heavenly things themselves,” and we read “Christ entered not into a holy place made with hands, like in pattern to the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us” (He 9.23-4). The old rite gave access into a tiny chamber which symbolised the presence of God, Christ’s sacrifice of Himself gave access into the very Presence itself.

The other contrast is with regard to those for whom access is effected. Under the former system the access secured was very limited, the most that can be said being that the High Priest himself, with the due exercise of stringent precautions, was able to enter the Holy of Holies on behalf of the people for a short time on one day of the year. The people must be for ever content with access by

26. Shebu. 1.6.

proxy. By contrast the access secured by Christ is for all His people, and it is no hesitant approach made in timidity behind a cloud of incense, but such an approach that we are exhorted "Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holy place by the blood of Jesus . . . let us draw near with a true heart in fulness of faith" (He 10.19ff.). When we reflect on the trepidation with which the High Priest's entrance into the Holy of Holies was regarded in the Mishnah,²⁷ we are able to gauge something of the magnitude of the advance.

(ii) *Purification*

The idea of purification from sin underlies the Day's rites, and is enshrined in the very name given to the Day, but it is difficult to discover just exactly what was thought to effect the atonement. At first glance it would seem that it was the scapegoat bearing the sins of the people away, but before this was done we have the explicit statement after the presentation of the blood of the goat for the sin offering "there shall be no man in the tent of meeting . . . until he come out, and have made atonement for himself, and for his household, and for all the assembly of Israel" (Lv 16.17). The difficulty is not resolved by appeal to the Mishnah, for there the confessions over the bullock and the scapegoat are identical (except for the widening from High Priest to High Priest and priestly caste, and then all the nation), and in general the tractate *Yoma* gives no indication that atonement is effected by one part of the day's ceremonial rather than another. In another Tractate there is a saying of R. Simeon "As the blood of the goat that is sprinkled within (the Holy of Holies) makes atonement for the Israelites, so does the blood of the bullock make atonement for the priests; and as the confession of sin recited over the scapegoat makes atonement for the Israelites, so does the confession of sin recited over the bullock make atonement for the priests."²⁸ Here we have atonement associated both with the blood and the confession, and with all three animals, the bullock, the goat for the sin-offering and the scapegoat.

Some see a way out of the difficulty by regarding the two goats as really being one sacrifice,²⁹ which may be hinted at in the fact noted above that in casting lots the

27. Cp the statement that the High Priest did not prolong his prayer in the Holy of Holies "lest he put Israel in terror" (*Yom.* 5.1).

28. *Shebu.* 1.7.

29. A. H. McNeille thinks that the scapegoat "was considered figuratively to be the same animal as the goat that was sacrificed. Its blood was shed for the atonement of the people, and, at the same time, it took upon itself the burden of their sins in order to carry it away" (*DCG* 1 296). Edersheim adopts a similar view, *The Temple: Its Ministry and Services*, pp. 312, 319.

High Priest said over both animals "A Sin-offering to the Lord" apparently making no difference between them, or addressing his remark to one rather than to the other. This is supported by the requirement that they should be as nearly as possible identical, and should even be purchased at the same time.³⁰ Again, while the Mishnah carefully records the laying on of hands and the confession over the bullock and the scapegoat, there is no mention of either in connection with the goat of the sin-offering. Could it be that those for the scapegoat sufficed for both animals? If this be accepted, the one offering of the two goats would then take away sin and secure access into the holiest. But the confession over the bullock is a difficulty in the way, to say nothing of other requirements such as the demand for repentance. Probably the whole of the Day's sacrifices were regarded as one comprehensive act of atonement, without attempting to distinguish sharply between the functions of the various parts.

Yet we must understand this in terms of the plain words of Lv 16.21 that when the High Priest lays hands on the head of the goat and confesses the nation's iniquities he puts them on the head of the goat. It is difficult to avoid the impression that the sacrifices availed because the animals bore away the sins which were laid upon them. While Lv 16 speaks of this only in the case of the scapegoat, the Mishnah makes no difference between this animal and the bullock in either the manner of the laying on of hands, or of the form of confession of sins. Lack of contrition will nullify the rite, but clearly efficacy is attached to the sacrificial rite, and this efficacy seems to be in bearing away the nation's sins.

It is surely this which gives point to the contention of the *auctor ad Hebraeos* that Christ was "once offered to bear the sins of many" (He 9.28), or again to his words "now once at the end of the ages hath he been manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself" (9.26), coming as they do in connection with a reference to the Day of Atonement ceremonies. Christ truly bore our sins, and carried them clean away, so that we see them no more.

There is some dispute as to whether the ceremonies of the Day of Atonement were held in Old Testament times to put away all sin, or sins of a ritual and inadvertent kind only, but there can be no doubt that by New Testament times the Day was held to put away serious sin. Thus Josephus speaks of the scapegoat "being intended to avert

30. Yom. 6.1.

and serve as an expiation for the sins of the whole people"³¹ which would hardly have been disputed by any contemporary adherent of the Jewish religion. But our author takes up this very point, denying that the ceremonies of the Day of Atonement can take away sin, the most he will allow being that in them "there is a remembrance made of sins year by year" (He 10.3), being "only carnal ordinances, imposed until a time of reformation" (9.10). They may "sanctify unto the cleanness of the flesh" (9.13), but more they cannot do, and he roundly affirms "it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins" (10.4). But what the Day of Atonement was powerless to effect Jesus did for men, for He "entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption" (9.12). We can see the Day of Atonement laying down the principle, but the removal of sin is due to Christ's once-for-all sacrifice of Himself. The animals in symbol bore the sins of the nation, the Christ in fact bore the sins of the world.

Out of the many further points we select one, namely that the Levitical system regards all sacrifices, including those of the Day of Atonement as being of Divine origin, so that when the High Priest entered within the veil, or put the people's sins on the head of the goat and sent them away into the wilderness he was simply doing what God in His mercy had commanded to be done. There is no process of magic or compulsion, nor do we see pagan ideas of appeasement. Atonement takes place only because God wills it and has ordained means whereby it may be accomplished.

The Epistle to the Hebrews opens with a majestic sentence stressing that God has always taken the initiative in His dealings with His people, and that this initiative remains in the Incarnation. From there on the author never loses sight of the fact that all is of God in the mighty work of man's salvation. In particular when he is thinking of the removal of sin in terms of the Day of Atonement he quotes Ps 40 and applies it to the work of Him who came to do the will of the Father, "By which will we have been sanctified by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all" (He 10.10). All is of grace, for all is of God.

Melbourne.

LEON MORRIS.

31. *Ant.* iii 10.3 (Loeb translation). Cp also the passage from Shebu. 1.6 cited above.

Book Reviews

AGAINST THE STREAM: POST-WAR WRITINGS.

By Karl Barth. Ed. R. Gregor Smith (S.C.M.), 1954, pp. 253; 16/-.

John Mackay has familiarised us with the difference between the "Balcony Approach" and the "Approach from the Road." In the former case we are only spectators: in the latter case we are involved and committed. No one can accuse Karl Barth of the "Balcony Approach." For many years he has been engaged in the immense task of writing his "Church Dogmatics": but this preoccupation has not isolated him from the struggles in which the Church has been engaged. On the contrary he has shown himself willing to be engaged in the difficult and responsible task of political encounter.

The title of this book is taken from an essay written by Karl Barth in reply to "an open letter" from Emil Brunner. Brunner complained that whereas Barth had uttered an unequivocal and unmis-takeable "No" to the claims of the Nazi totalitarian State, Barth was now hesitant and uncertain in the struggle between the East and West. Barth replied:—"I cannot admit that it is the duty of Christians or of the Church to give theological backing to what every citizen can, with much shaking of his head, read in his daily paper and what is so admirably expressed by Mr. Truman and by the Pope. Has the 'East' or whatever we may call it, really such a hold over us that we must needs oppose it with our last breath when the last but one would suffice? No, when the Church witnesses it moves in fear and trembling, not with the stream but against it."

These addresses are powerful and incisive. Barth writes with immense vigour and great gusto. He does not evade the difficult questions but gives his judgment as a responsible Christian theologian. His judgments are based, not on the conclusions of natural law, but on the revelation of God in Jesus Christ. Barth scrupulously avoids the role of a prophet. He does not speak *ex cathedra* nor does he claim infallibility. For example, he was asked by the Reformed Church of Hungary to comment on the proposed Concordat between Church and State. With true humility Barth replied:—"My dear fathers and brothers, it is not entirely easy for me to comply with this request. It may savour of unwarranted interference if I now take the liberty of sending you the following comments. Please forgive me and please take them as a quite unofficial expression of my serious and brotherly interest in the life of your Church. They are not intended to be binding on anyone." Barth denies that it is possible to formulate political "principles." In the concrete situation of daily decisions we must seek God's guidance for each situation. We are the servants of the Living God. "The Church's concern must never be with political principles, creeds and catechisms but only with definite and concrete political constellations. . . . It cannot have a 'programme' because it has a living Master Whom it has to serve in the most varied circumstances and situations."

The translator sums up Barth's contribution when he writes:—"Barth's style is massive and complex; yet I hope that the present volume indicates, even in translation, something of the wit as well as the sobriety, the humour and cheerfulness as well as the serious purpose, the robust and merry character of Barth's faith as well as its unyielding strength. Even if no translation can properly capture these qualities, yet I think it worth saying explicitly that characteristic of Barth's style (and reminiscent of Luther's) is an earthy

tang, an athletic sinewy idiom of common speech, which gives pith and vigour to his thinking." Barth castigates those whose Christian concern is limited to matters of personal piety and practice. "The Church must not give the impression that it never wakes from the sleep of an otherwise non-political existence until such matters as gambling or the abuse of alcohol or the desecration of the Sabbath or similar questions of a religious and ethical nature in the narrower sense are under discussion, as if such problems were not in fact only on the verge of real political life."

This is a volume to be pondered. It illustrates the kind of contribution which can be made by a man who is theologically informed and whose theological thinking is brought to bear on the perplexing and pressing problems of modern political life. Barth's conclusions may, or may not, be right: at least he tries to grapple with contemporary problems with the point of view of divine revelation. God grant that we may profit from his example.

Melbourne.

S. BARTON BABBAGE.

THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

By G. C. Berkouwer (Eerdmans. Grand Rapids), 1954, pp. 368; \$4.

Next to Barth's *Church Dogmatics*, the series of nineteen studies in course of preparation by the Amsterdam theologian constitutes the most extensive dogmatical project of to-day. This, the fourth volume to be translated into English, seeks to explicate Chalcedon, through an obedient understanding of the Scriptures.

In his prolegomena Berkouwer gives a brief critical review of modern opponents of the *vere deus, vere homo* from Schleiermacher to Bultmann, with a more detailed appraisal of the damaging Ritschlian conception of the person of Christ. Having thus cleared the ground, he comes to the Scriptural evidence, and, after rejecting the typology associated with Vischer as detrimental to thinking in truly historical manner of the works of God, he cogently contends that in the N.T. Jesus Christ is the object of faith which is the response to revelation and not a projection of consciousness. In his chapter on "The Humanity of Christ" Berkouwer trenchantly challenges the accepted Roman interpretation of Mark 13:32 as being based on dogmatic a priori and not exegetical scriptural grounds and maintains that failure to recognize the limitation of the knowledge of Jesus Christ in the flesh points to "the indubitable element of Docetism." In view of this it is rather surprising to find him later exposing himself to a similar charge when he asserts the *non posse peccare*.

The latter portion of the book is given to various questions that have emerged in the history of theology. The differences between the Lutheran and Reformed Christological conceptions, which partly reproduced the ancient emphases of Alexandria and Antioch, are discussed at some length. The writer, whilst vigorously defending Calvin from the accusation of Nestorianism, fully recognizes the stress the Reformer laid on the distinction of the two natures as an expression of his basic maintaining of creaturely limits. The growing Protestant aversion to the term *theotokos* is justified owing to the altered appraisal of the designation as seen against the backdrop of the development of Mariology with its increasing tendency to erase the limits of creaturehood. Berkouwer earlier observed that the heretical pro-Sabellian term *homoousios* of the third century became, under different circumstances, the orthodox anti-Arian slogan of the fourth; but he fails here to indicate that the reverse process has operated and the orthodox

anti-Nestorian term, *theotokos*, of the fifth century, has become, under different circumstances, the heretical pro-Roman catchword of the twentieth.

As to the terms Anhypostasy and Enhypostasy, the Dutch theologian appears to agree with Barth, that, properly understood, they point to God as acting in the Incarnation, the man Jesus having no separate mode of existence but only immediately and exclusively in the eternal Son of God. However, he holds these terms have no dogmatic or confessional fixation and in their varied uses have been so repeatedly subject to a Docetic interpretation as to be of no great value. Finally, in the union of the two natures under the aspect of its revelational significance, Berkouwer rejects the *incognito* theory of the dialectical theologians in favour of Calvin's concept of *occultatio*. *The causa scandali* does not lie in the structure of revelation but in unbelief in connection with the humiliation of Christ. "Hence the offense at his birth and at his cross does not consist in the concealment of the deity in the humanity but rather in the divinely revealed message concerning the humiliated Son" (p. 356).

This volume, like its predecessors, freely elucidated from Dutch sources, makes a valuable contribution to contemporary theological debate from the angle of Reformed orthodoxy. It is to be hoped that future volumes in the series will be free of the many printing errors which abound in this book.

Melbourne.

R. SWANTON.

CALVIN: THEOLOGICAL TREATISES.

Translated with Introductions and Notes by J. K. S. Reid (S.C.M., The Library of Christian Classics, Vol. xxii), 1954, pp. 355; 30/-.

PORTRAIT OF CALVIN.

By T. H. L. Parker (S.C.M.), 1954, pp. 124; 7/6.

The first volume is composed of some of the more important treatises that appeared over a century ago in the *Tracts* published by the Calvin Translation Society (and reprinted to-day in the U.S.A. by Eerdmans) and a few shorter writings a number of which are for the first time rendered into English. The translation, which is more expressive than the rather stiff nineteenth century writing of Beveridge, is from the text of the *Corpus Reformatorum*, apparently little use having been made of the recent *Opera Selecta*.

The selection of materials has been influenced, as indicated in the General Introduction, by two main considerations—the varied functions which Calvin discharged as administrator, teacher, apologist and controversialist, and his exposition of certain characteristic doctrines. The choice, doubtless, on the whole has been wise, but a lack of proportion is evident in the inclusion of as many as five different treatises on the Lord's Supper. Further, it is regrettable that limitations of space have permitted the inclusion of only two brief statements on the important subject of Predestination. Of course, *The Eternal Predestination of God* was too lengthy for insertion but the inclusion of the Introduction to the closely related *The Secret Providence of God* may have been the means of providing a more adequate presentation of this aspect of the Reformer's thought.

The Ecclesiastical Ordinances and *The Catechism of the Church of Geneva* constitute two basic documents, for the former enunciates the foundation principles of Reformed polity and the latter, regarded by Barth as the best of Reformed doctrinal standards, came later to

exercise a wide and deep influence as evidenced, for instance, in the structure and contents of the Westminster Catechisms. The Strassburg period (1538-41) when Calvin in his young maturity, free from the distracting cares of Geneva, produced his best writing, is represented by that outstanding controversial tract, *Reply to Sadeloto*, which sharply contrasts the Roman and Reformed conceptions of the Church, and his lucid *Short Treatise on the Lord's Supper*, in which he eirenically pursues a *via media* between Luther and Zwingli. However, as a contrast, in one of his later writings, *Concerning the True Partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ* (1561), where he replies to the fierce polemics of the Lutheran Heshsiusius, Calvin freely indulges, as on other occasions, in violent invective not uncommon in the controversies of his day.

The S.C.M. Press is to be commended on publishing concurrently the *Portrait of Calvin*, for this useful sketch of the life and work of the Reformer, effectively illustrated from his writings, constitutes an appropriate background and framework into which the reader may easily fit the *Treatises*. The author, a recognized Calvin scholar, through his clear writing and often vivid style, paints a life-like portrait of his subject. When he writes on "The Theologian," here as elsewhere, largely under the influence of Barth, Parker maintains that the Christocentric nature of Calvin's theology is impaired by his doctrines of the Knowledge of God the Creator and of Predestination—criticisms partly answered by E. A. Dowey in his recent monograph.

In the closing chapter, "The Ecumenical Churchman," the deep concern of the Reformer for the unity of the Christian Church is rightly recognized. However, especially in view of modern tendencies, greater stress could have been aptly given to the fact that Calvin was only concerned about the Scriptural principle of unity in truth, for, as Barth pointed out long ago, the Reformer wrote his *Institutes* before he wrote his much admired letters expressing his active, world-embracing spirit as to the unity of the Church. "In a word, he first had a *theme* and *then* developed its variations; first he *knew* what he wanted and *then* he wanted what he knew. The desire . . . to reverse this quite natural order, to begin where Calvin left off without having sown with him, is neither Calvinistic nor commendable" (*The Word of God and the Word of Man*, p. 224).

Melbourne.

R. SWANTON

DIE THEOLOGIE REINHOLD NIEBUHRS

By Hans Hofmann (Zwingli-Verlag, Zurich), 1954, pp. 245; Fr. 13.50.

This work is quite the most competent analysis that we have had to date of the Theology of Reinhold Niebuhr. Its genius lies in the fact that it does not regard Niebuhr's writings as a set of documents which can be examined in their own right in isolation from the man, as if their inner connections and self-contradictions were the most important subject of discussion. The writer relates Niebuhr's work to the situation in which his career began—in a parish in the city of Detroit. Niebuhr had come to that parish with the typically Liberal equipment of the day, a young minister who was to discover that the theories of the schools had little relevance to the brutal facts of modern industrialised society. Confronted with the concrete problems which his parish presented, he endeavoured to discover what was the relevance of the Gospel to the world. Even when later he was called to the chair of Applied Christianity in Union Theological Seminary, and was able, by the leisure thus afforded

(though Niebuhr's idea of leisure and ours might be vastly different!), to bring to the analysis and solution of his original problems the great insights of traditional Christianity; he never lost sight of the concrete situation in which his searching had begun. So Hans Hofmann claims that there are no breaks in his development, or that new emphases emerge to eclipse those of his earlier days. The unifying bond throughout is his concern for the relevance of the Gospel to the world.

Though the writer maintains that Niebuhr is not a systematic theologian, nevertheless his treatment of Niebuhr's thought is systematically carried out. He follows in the main a chronological pattern, which enables him to cover the entirety of Niebuhr's writings in a detailed way, and to show how, despite the unity of purpose above mentioned, there is nevertheless development of thought. The two outstanding developments are, on the one hand, the increasing Christocentricity of his theology (exhibited by his more frequent use of the word "Christianity" rather than that of "religion," a loose term which was an early heritage of his Liberal training); and his profounder understanding of the nature of sin as pride, of its radical nature and of its universal ramifications. The relational pattern which Hofmann regards as basic to Niebuhr's thought is that of God-Man-Society. All Niebuhr's major themes—the social and economic aspects of man's fallenness, the prejudices that affect man's judgment and behaviour, the notion of "myth," the concept of "tragedy," man's attempts to save himself, the fragmentariness of history, the centrality of the Cross, the dialectical criticisms of non-Christian doctrines of man and history—are approached in the light of his teaching on sin, which is basic to his whole theology. It is most refreshing to find the charge of pessimism, which is so often superficially levelled against Niebuhr, so categorically scotched. Hofmann does so by defining the limits of Niebuhr's pessimism—it is directed against all false optimism, false hopes of man's redemption by history and false Utopias; and by indicating the presence in Niebuhr's works of a true optimism, stemming from the Cross and Resurrection of Our Lord.

Perhaps the most impressive feature of the book is the ecumenical spirit in which the writer approaches his subject. He sees the work of Niebuhr as both a challenge to East and West (to use the current language) for Niebuhr's criticisms are directed against both; and as a meeting place for joint discussions. English readers will be surprised by the number of lengthy quotations (in German translation) from the writings of Niebuhr, and will find that at times the writer gives us what is in effect lengthy paraphrases of, and commentaries upon, these extracts. But it has to be remembered that the book is designed for European readers who either do not read English or have no ready access to Niebuhr's writings. The result is indeed a happy one, for many of the more difficult elements of Niebuhr's thought are thus expertly expounded.

Hofmann's work, then, leaves us with two hopes: the first, that we shall soon have before us Niebuhr's own review of it; and the second, that it will soon be translated into English, so that it may reach a wider public, particularly in Australia, where the full stature of Niebuhr is not always appreciated.

JOHN MCINTYRE.

Sydney.

CHRIST THE CONQUEROR: IDEAS OF CONFLICT AND VICTORY
IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

By Ragnar Leivestad (S.P.C.K., London), 1954, xii plus 320 pp.
25/-.

This book, written in English by a Norwegian scholar—and he is to be congratulated on his English—sets out to analyse and correlate the various expressions in the N.T. of the *Christus Victor* theme. It contains first an introduction dealing briefly with ideas of conflict and victory in Jewish eschatology; then some two hundred pages devoted to an “exegetical examination of the N.T. material,” where the relevant matter in each group of N.T. writings is discussed in turn, with copious quotations chiefly from continental scholars; then, in 60 pages, an “analytical survey of the antagonistic ideas”; finally a conclusion in two pages, in which some of the threads are drawn together. Some of the questions which arise are these. The “zelotic” Jewish messianism was rejected by our Lord; is it wrong that phrases expressing this idea should remain in the picture of the glorified Christ in the Apocalypse? Is the “dynamistic” motif, which appears in the casting out of demons in the gospels, correlated with that of the victory of Christ in His death and resurrection over Satan and sin and death? There is on one side His moral victory, and on the other what our author calls the “metaphysical” victory which depends on the coming of the Son of God from heaven to save mankind; are there then two distinct christological trends in the N.T., the one “adoptionist” and the other “kenotic”? In what he calls the “dramatic-mythological” interpretation of Christ’s work, how are the two Advents correlated, that of the Incarnation and that of the Parousia, and the two battles, of Calvary and of Armageddon? Finally, what is the part of the Church Militant in the great conflict?

Our author has undertaken and is grappling very valiantly with a task of central importance for the biblical theologian, that of stripping down and analysing the expressions in the N.T. of the conflict-theme. Many things, I think, he says well, but many others not at all well; and the book as a whole leaves me dissatisfied. The root-fault, as it seems to me, is that he never discusses the nature of the task which he has undertaken. Is it simply to analyse the theological ideas which the N.T. contains? But the theologian must do more than this; he must discuss the relation of those ideas to divine Revelation. In what does Revelation consist? In a bare record of the divine saving acts? or in that, *plus* a systematized scheme of revealed doctrines? or does it consist in a record of the divine acts interpreted at each point by imagery in which the dogma is expressed? If it is right to hold that the word “imagery” supplies the clue, then the work of the exegete is first to see for himself the images with which each N.T. writer in each passage is working; and then to strip down and analyse the images, and correlate them with other images given elsewhere. It will then be wrong method to search the N.T. material for proof-texts in order to construct a systematic scheme; or again, to assume that there is such a systematic scheme underlying the thought of the writers.

If the author had given us such a discussion, this might have been a great book. As it is, he does not do justice to the imagery with which he is dealing. In his exegetical section, I think he is confused by the great number of authorities that he quotes; he would have done better if he had summarized them briefly, and then presented the imagery in his own way, as he himself was able to

see it. Further, I think he is dogged by the notion that there must be a systematized scheme underlying the biblical texts; he is troubled at one point by "an emotional and poetical strain which resists translation by precise doctrinal definitions" (p. 303); in other words, he is not accepting the imagery as imagery, in the terms in which the Bible gives it to us. It does not belong to the nature of imagery that images such as those of King and High Priest in Heb. 8:1 ff.—the King seated enthroned, the Priest standing to minister—should be literally reconcilable with one another. Both images are valid in their own right; and they find their unity in the Reality which they signify.

Crafers, South Australia.

GABRIEL HEBERT, S.S.M.

DAS LEIDEN DES UNSCHULDIGEN IN BABYLON UND ISRAEL

By Johann Jacob Stamm. *Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments*. Edited by W. Eichrodt and O. Cullmann. No. 10 (Zwingli-Verlag, Zuerich), 1946, pp. 83; Fr. 5.50.

This is not a new book. But it has established itself as a standard work in its field. Dr. Stamm does theologians the signal service of bringing together the thoughts of the Babylonians, with whom the Hebrews had so much contact, upon the eternal question of the suffering of the innocent, with the handling of the question that Israel gave it. The first section of the monograph deals in historical sequence, beginning from the pre-Hammurabic period, with the question as handled by poet and priest. Much of this material is not easily accessible to the ordinary student. Thereafter Stamm traverses more familiar ground, as he describes, with many quotations, the growing thought of Israel on the question, until there appears the remarkable doctrine of the vicarious suffering of the righteous. The final chapter is valuable, in that it offers a clear comparison between the Babylonian and the Israelitic views of the meaning and purpose of suffering. In both peoples, Stamm claims, the Wisdom writers concerned themselves deeply with the problem, but eventually they parted company. The Babylonian Wisdom writing ends in complete sceptical resignation; death for the Sage is preferable to the rewards that this life actually brings to the suffering good man. The philosophical problem thus here remains unanswered. Israel, on the other hand, was able to wrestle through to a satisfying answer to the problem, because Israel knew its God as a personal "Thou." This is very evident in the case of the Biblical Job, where human experience takes on reality apart from "religion" and "cult," and is rooted in a personal knowledge of a personal and purposeful God. Consequently it is only Israel that can develop a doctrine of vicarious suffering, and clothe the doctrine in the personal terms familiar to us in the Suffering Servant concept. Babylonian religion had no concept of revelation, no prophetic word to expound the meaning of history. So it was a religion without a message. But Israel made suffering itself a means of proclaiming God's message to the world.

Dunedin.

G. A. F. KNIGHT.

J. GRESHAM MACHEN.

By N. B. Stonehouse (Eerdmans, Grand Rapids), 1954, pp. 520; \$5.95.

Student, colleague and successor of the subject of this biography, Dr. N. B. Stonehouse is eminently qualified to write the memoir of one who in his day was a most significant figure in the theological and ecclesiastical life of the U.S.A.

With a Southern ancestry, James Gresham Machen was born at Baltimore in 1881 of devout and cultured parents. Educated at Johns Hopkins, Princeton, Marburg (where as Barth he had that "unforgettable teacher Wilhelm Herrmann") and Goettingen, he passed through a prolonged period of doubt and it was not until 1914 upon his election as Assistant Professor of N.T. at Princeton that he was ordained to the ministry in the Northern Presbyterian Church. Having thus arrived, he now tenaciously held to the Christian Faith as set forth on the basis of the Holy Scriptures in the Standards of Westminster, and this, the constituted doctrinal position of his Church, found in him a vigorous exponent against the rising tides of Liberalism. However, the forces arrayed against a militant orthodoxy proved too powerful—the reconstruction of Princeton Seminary in 1929 led with others to his withdrawal and the foundation of the independent Westminster Seminary, and, finally, the controversy occasioned by the publication of the syncretistic *Rethinking Missions*, resulting in the establishment of the Independent Board of Presbyterian Missions from which Machen refused to resign at the mandate of the General Assembly, culminated in his and his associates' suspension from the ministry of his denomination in 1936. There followed the foundation of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, but worn with labour and conflict its leading figure died the following year at the early age of fifty-five. Doubtless, as his biographer suggests, Machen was not free of defects of leadership and errors of judgment, but this tragic narrative makes sad reading in that a man of his outstanding gifts and Christian character was subject to such widespread misrepresentation and deep humiliation, but more so in that a strong established denomination came thus to pursue a policy of inclusivism which whilst tolerating radical deviations from its constituted doctrine on the one side, yet enforced the most drastic penalties against any challenge to the bureaucratic functioning of its ecclesiastical machinery on the other. The Presbyterian conflict was of wide significance in that here were focused the wider issues of Protestantism in America and beyond.

This volume is replete with interesting references to prominent personalities of the period such as Wodrow Wilson, with whom Machen was acquainted at Baltimore and more intimately at Princeton, and Ross Stevenson, one of Machen's main opponents, who became so prominent in the ecumenical movement. "And it is remembered," says Stonehouse, "that the World Council of Churches was launched by the Archbishop of York in the livingroom of 'Springdale,' the presidential residence at Princeton with the full sympathy and support of Dr. Stevenson" (p.213). The decisive influence in Machen's early theological thinking was that of the brilliant Frances Landy Patton, who was successively President of Princeton University and Seminary, but more profound and enduring was the influence of that great master of Reformed theology, the erudite Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield, the mantle of whose leadership after 1921 appears largely to have fallen upon Machen. As scholar, apologist, teacher, Machen has a lasting memorial in his writings. Thus, to mention but three:—*The Virgin Birth of Christ* (1930) remains the most adequate treatment in English of a difficult subject; *Christianity and Liberalism* (1923) continues a classic with its incisiveness on the issue of humanistic modernism and the historic Faith; *New Testament Greek for Beginners* (1923), a splendid text-book, is used widely to the present day.

The many varied aspects of Machen's life and character are dealt with at length—his considerable achievements as an Alpine climber, his experiences as a Y.M.C.A. officer in France in World War

his strong aversion to increasing state control, his great popularity with his students, his unstinted generosity, his concern for the unfortunate—all these contribute to the picture of a virile and gracious personality. Finally, it must be said, the strongest influence in his life was that of his remarkable mother (authoress of *The Bible in Browning* published by Macmillan in 1903) with whom there existed a relationship of rare mutual devotion and understanding as shown in the correspondence of nearly thirty years upon which, as evidence of Machen's innermost thoughts and feelings, this memoir has largely drawn.

This is a good biography both as to its factual nature and sympathetic interpretation of a learned and valiant apologist of the Biblical faith and the Reformed Confession.

R. SWANTON.

Melbourne.

SHORTER NOTICES.

The Christian Hope, by T. A. Kantonen (Muhlenberg, \$1.50). In preparation for the Evanston Assembly, Professor Kantonen gave a series of lectures to Lutheran pastors of the United States and Canada. It is a study in Biblical Eschatology which "seeks to adhere resolutely to the Word, conceived with Luther as 'the Gospel of God concerning His Son,' to abide by the Word even when it contradicts our wishes and traditions, and to be silent when the Word is silent" (p. iii). It begins with a survey of the idea of "hope" in the Bible and in the history of the Church. The second chapter ("If a Man Die") is an excellent piece of Biblical theology. In the discussion of death, the Biblical doctrine of the wholeness of man is contrasted with the platonic doctrine of immortality. In rejecting the latter he allows himself to say that death is annihilation (p. 34), but this is contradicted later (p. 36, 47). In discussing life after death he departs from traditional Lutheranism and presents the orthodox Reformed doctrine of the intermediate state. The Christian idea of History, of the Anti-Christ, the Millenium, the Second Coming, the Resurrection and Final Judgment are then examined. Professor Kantonen takes note of the best contemporary discussions, and introduces material from Finnish theologians. He avoids the empty moralism of liberalism, the otherworldliness latent in Barthianism, and the absurdities of literalistic sectarianism. It is a very stimulating and satisfying discussion. There is a magnificent presentation of the ethical consequences of the Christian hope. "It is not an ideology but a life-transforming power which flows from being in Christ and having access here and now to the resources of His coming kingdom." There are a few examples of questionable exegesis, e.g., Heb. 11:40 (p. 38); 2 Pet. 3:10 (p. 86) and the argument "it is extremely difficult to believe" (p. 40) has no place in Biblical theology. But these slips could not be said to mar this splendid study.

F. I. Andersen.

Verheissung und Erfuellung, by Werner Georg Kuemmel (Zwingli-Verlag, Zuerich, Fr. 15.60). This is the second edition of an earlier essay of 1944, of special interest for the English-speaking reader because of the fact that the Anglo-American literature on the subject of N.T. eschatology, which during the War was not available on the Continent, has been considered and dealt with. Apart from that the subject is of general interest in view of the central theme of the Evanston Assembly. The author's aim is to show the untenableness of the

conception of A. Schweitzer and others of the "consequent eschatology" as well as that of the "realized eschatology," as represented by C. H. Dodd and others, and to give a better solution himself. In a very thorough and minute investigation of N.T. notions and texts relevant to the question, the author comes to three conclusions. Firstly, that Jesus, although anticipating a shorter or longer interval between his death and his parousia, proclaimed the immanent approach of the Kingdom of God within his own generation. Secondly, that Jesus' eschatological preaching forms a most striking contrast with the point of view of contemporary apocalyptic teaching in so far that it is not chiefly interested in the proclamation of future eschatological events, but has its main point of interest elsewhere. Thirdly, that Jesus claimed the coming Kingdom to be already realized and present in his own life and work, in anticipation of its complete coming and establishment in the future. In this way the author succeeds in safeguarding the fact, so very essential in God's revelation and in the Christian faith, that the person and work of Jesus are of a fundamental and not of an accidental nature in God's historic activity in connection with the establishment of His Kingdom.

J. B. Groenewegen.

A Commentary on I Maccabees, by J. C. Dancey (Blackwell, 18/-). This answers the need for a good guide to this important document which deals with the second century B.C., now that the immediate pre-Christian period has been illumined by the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The text of I Maccabees is not printed in this book. The commentary, however, supplies just the degree of help the ordinary reader desires and needs. The 50-page Introduction raises issues that demand fuller treatment than they have received, yet essential ground has been covered. There is a useful Bibliography.

Oral Tradition, by Eduard Nielson (S.C.M., Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 11, 7/-). A school of Scandinavian Old Testament scholars, centred on Uppsala and led by Professor Engnell, has recently severely criticised the "orthodox" Documentary Hypothesis in the realm of Pentateuchal criticism. Using what they themselves call a "traditio-historical" approach to questions both of Pentateuchal criticism and of criticism of the written records of the oracles of the Prophets, they believe that much of the Old Testament material was preserved orally for centuries before being committed to writing. Professor H. H. Rowley, who writes a Preface to the study, and who is critical of their work, points out that much of the argument of this school has not been accessible to English readers, so that this short study provides an admirable introduction to their findings so far.

G. A. F. Knight.

Life Together, by Dietrich Bonhoeffer (S.C.M., 4/6). The name of Bonhoeffer is a distinguished one in the roll of twentieth century martyrs. He died in a concentration camp. These devotional studies are spiritually rewarding and deeply searching. The author's warm and humble faith is apparent in every page. This is a book for meditation and self-examination.

Love, Power and Justice: Ontological Analyses and Ethical Applications, by Paul Tillich (O.U.P., 17/6 Aus.). This is a rewarding book. Its supreme merit is its clarity and penetrating insight. The author subjects to meticulous analysis the three well-known terms, love, power,

and justice, and he shows that their ethical application is dependent upon their ontological analysis. It is good to have the basic significance of these words so helpfully discussed, and to have an interpretation which is neither sentimental nor subjective. The author's discussion is rigidly and ruthlessly theological and ontological, and the resulting study is a remarkable achievement of insight and analysis.

From Faith to Fear, by D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones (I.V.F., 2/6). The minister of Westminster Chapel is first and foremost a Biblical theologian. In this series of addresses on the book of Habbukuk, he powerfully expounds the message of the prophet and enunciates the principles of divine government, which are relevant to our day as to the day of the prophet. These addresses, whilst not exhausting, are nevertheless penetrating and suggestive.

The Theology of Evangelism, by T. A. Kantonen (Muhlenberg, \$1.25). This is a helpful attempt to discuss evangelism from the point of view of Biblical theology. The author shows that evangelism is a direct expression of our belief in the Triune God. Anglo-Saxon readers will particularly appreciate the arresting quotations from Luther. This is a competent and rewarding study.

The Chosen People, or the Bible, Christianity and Race, by G. W. Broomfield (Longmans, 6/-). This is a topical study dealing with African racial problems. The author, who is eminently fitted to discuss these problems, turns to the Bible for guidance. His attitude is one of sweet reasonableness. Where specific directions in the Bible are wanting, he seeks for relative Christian axioms. The author is to be commended for his honesty and candour.

S. Barton Babbage.

The Parables of Jesus by Joachim Jeremias (S.C.M., 16/-). The Second Edition (1952) in the original of this important work was reviewed at some length in our Vol. xii, No. 3 by Dr. H. Sasse. This translation by Professor S. H. Hooke is from the Third Edition (1954) which is substantially the same as the Second.

Interpreting Paul's Gospel, by A. M. Hunter (S.C.M., 10/6). Here "salvation," the central word in Paul's Gospel, is expounded, with its application in our contemporary world, in its past, present and future aspects. The writer, with his customary lucidity, achieves his objective in an admirable manner.

Katherine, Wife of Luther, by Clara S. Schreiber (Muhlenberg, \$2.45). Based upon known facts, this is an imaginative construction of the life of the Reformer's masterful wife, the efficient *hausfrau* who converted the dilapidated old Black Cloister into a real home with its multitude of boarders and guests. The portrait is well drawn, with considerable insight into the work and mission of Luther.

Accompanists of the Gospel, edited by Henry A. Bruinsma (Calvin College, Grand Rapids). The papers presented at the First Annual Calvin College Conference on Church Music in 1953 comprehensively cover the theory, history and practice of the subject. A high standard, governed by the true conception of worship as "a meeting with God" is attained, although, at times, the marginal element in song as *a parte Dei* is over-emphasised. Throughout due recognition is given to the fact that the Reformed Churches possess a rich and unique heritage in Genevan Psalmody.

R. Swanton.

Book Reviews

	Page
BARTH, KARL: Against the Stream	20
By the Very Rev. Principal S. Barton Babbage, M.A., Ph.D., Th.D., Ridley College, Melbourne.	
BERKOUWER, G. C.: The Person of Christ	21
By the Rev. R. Swanton, M.A., B.D., Melbourne.	
CALVIN, JOHN: Theological Treatises	22
By the Rev. R. Swanton.	
PARKER, T. H. L.: Portrait of Calvin	22
By the Rev. R. Swanton.	
HOFMANN, HANS: Die Theologie Reinhold Niebuhrs	23
By the Rev. Professor John McIntyre, M.A., B.D., D.Litt., Principal of St. Andrew's College, University of Sydney.	
LEIVESTAD, RAGNAR: Christ the Conqueror	25
By the Rev. A. G. Hebert, M.A., D.D., S.S.M., St. Michael's House, Crafers, South Australia.	
STAMM, J. J.: Das Leiden des Unschuldigen in Babylon und Israel	26
By the Rev. Professor G. A. Knight, M.A., B.D., Knox College, University of Otago.	
STONEHOUSE, N. B.: J. Gresham Machen	26
By the Rev. R. Swanton.	
SHORTER NOTICES	28

